DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 597 RC 015 278

AUTHOR	Goforth, Joan L.
TITLE	Rural Education Program: Site A. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 76
CONTRACT	400-76-0025; NE-C-00-3-0074
NOTE	68p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	American Indian Education; Anglo Americans; Change Agents; *Change Strategies; *Citizen Participation; Community Problems; Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Formative Evaluation; *Participative Decision Making; *Program Implementation; Questionnaires; Rural American Indians; *Rural Education; School Community Relationship; *School Districts
IDENTIFIERS	Facilitators; Navajo (Nation); *Rural Futures Development Strategy; Utah

ABSTRACT

The Rural Education Program (REP) is funded to develop a strategy--the Rural Futures Development (RFD) Strategy--that encourages local initiative and participation in educational change. The strategy was installed in the San Juan School District in southeastern Utah (Site "A") from August 1974 to June 1976 and represented the first installation of the integrated strategy. Site A is a remote, large, and sparsely-populated area containing two distinct language and cultural groups--Navajo and Anglo. Strategy installation involved selecting four process facilitators and a local RFD coordinator, forming three school-community groups, conducting needs assessments, and initiating numerous training and planning activities. The evaluation of Site A was designed to monitor the RFD Strategy at the local school district level and to assist REP in defining and refining the strategy. A survey questionnaire was used to assess community members' perceptions of change over RFD's 2-year installation period. Sample size was 331; response rate was 41%. Most respondents perceived an improvement in educational quality; two-thirds felt the work done by school-community groups and school staff had improved the quality of educational decisions in their community. This report includes detailed reviews of evaluation procedures and results, the evaluation instruments, and data describing the local school district. (JHZ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257597

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Published by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, a private nonprofit corporation. The work contained herein has been developed pursuant to contract Nos. NE-C-00-3-0074 and 400-76-0025 with the Group on School Capacity for Problem Solving of the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the Institute should be inferred.

Rural Education Program

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

SITE A

by

Joan L. Goforth

December 1976

Rural Education Program

Frank Anderson, Director

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

710 S.W. Second Avenue

Portland, Oregon 97204

Telephone: (503) 248-6835

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgement		iv
Foreword		v
1.0 Introduction		1
	1.1 Purpose of the Report and Audiences	1
	1.2 Context of the Evaluation	1
2.0 Description of the Rural Futures Development Strategy		3
	2.1 Developmental History of the RFD Strategy	3
	2.2 RFD Strategy Description	4
3.0 RFD Strategy as Installed in Site A		7
	3.1 Site A Context	7
	3.2 Description of the Strategy as Installed in Site A	8
4.0 Design of the Evaluation		13
	4.1 Questions, Methods and Instrumentation Utilized in the Site A Evaluation	14
5.0 Evaluation Results		17
	5.1 Input for Strategy Refinement	17
	5.2 Response of Strategy Participants and Community Members to the RFD Strategy	23
	5.3 Survey Results	25
	5.4 Response of the Navajo Population	33
	5.5 Summary of Survey	35
	5.6 Direct Costs of Strategy Implementation	35
Appendix A: Instruments		37
Appendix B: Baseline Data		55

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am grateful to the staff of the Research and Evaluation Unit for providing me with expertise and support in conducting this evaluation and in preparing this report. I wish to acknowledge the considerable assistance given to me with both the design and the data collection by William J. Wright. Others I wish to thank who assisted with data collection tasks were Bev Anderson, Sue Hiscox and Kim Yap. Finally, a special thanks to Nick Smith who argued and fought with me and who occasionally let me win.

FOREWORD

This evaluation was conducted under contracts with the National Institute of Education as part of the development work of the Rural Futures Development (RFD) Strategy. Additionally, resources obtained from the school district through the contract for installation of the Rural Futures Development Strategy specified an amount to be used for evaluation of the strategy. These resources were expended for the final data collection activities which occurred in June of 1976. Finally, as part of their involvement with the RFD Strategy the Utah Department of Education will be conducting an independent evaluation of the Site A installation during the fall of 1976.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the Report and Audiences

The purpose of this evaluation report is to document the evaluation activities that took place during the installation of the Rural Education Program's Rural Futures Development (RFD) Strategy in the San Juan School District in southeastern Utah from August 1974 to June 1976. Audiences for this report include the Rural Education Program (REP), the National Institute of Education, the San Juan School District, and the Utah State Department of Education.

This report is organized into five sections. The Introduction gives a brief orientation. Section two describes the developmental history of the RFD Strategy and presents a general description of the strategy. Section three provides the reader with a description of Site A and of strategy events and activities as they occurred there. Section four outlines the evaluation questions and describes the instrumentation, procedures, and activities employed during the evaluation. Section five presents and discusses the data collected for strategy refinement and the results of the survey designed to determine impact on the community.

1.2 Context of the Evaluation

In August 1974 the Rural Education Program began working with the San Juan School District (Site A) to implement the Rural Futures Development Strategy, a process designed to help rural communities and school systems improve local learning opportunities. For the district, this strategy installation provided an opportunity to increase local community participation in educational decision making. For the REP Site A offered an opportunity for continued strategy development and refinement. Site A was to be the setting within which the first tryout of the multiple components of the integrated RFD Strategy would occur. Additionally, a contract with the Utah State Department of Education was negotiated which called for the REP staff to assist them in establishing a task force at the state level to consider issues related to community involvement in educational decision-making and to provide training for two of their staff members which would prepare them to train future process facilitators.

Concurrent with the strategy installation activities of Site A were the ongoing NWREL development and strategy refinement tasks. REP staff members were preparing a written description of the integrated RFD Strategy, as well as putting together a set of process and outcome goals and objectives for the strategy.

Prior to the installation of the integrated strategy in Site A, evaluation activities had focused upon the individual strategy components, such as the school, family, and curriculum. The Site A experience was to be the first evaluative look at the integrated strategy. This examination was begun prior to the completion of the written description of the integrated strategy and completion of the set of strategy goals and objectives. The focus for the evaluation became one of assisting the REP in identifying the critical elements of the strategy and highlighting both successes and difficulties resulting from strategy implementation in Site A.

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE RURAL FUTURES DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

2.1 Developmental History of the RFD Strategy

Effective March 1, 1973, the Rural Education Program (REP) of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory entered into a multi-year agreement with the National Institute of Education. Under the terms of this contract the Rural Education Program began developing a set of Rural Futures Development (RFD) Strategies aimed at strengthening the problem-solving capacities of rural school systems, communities, classrooms, and families. These strategies were defined as Community Centered, School Centered, Learner Centered, Support Agency Centered, and Family Centered. Each strategy aimed at a different target system but was tied to the others by undergirding principles, values, and approaches to change. Each strategy was composed of processes and products intended for use by local problem solvers or by state and regional agencies who could support local people's efforts.

However, by November 1974 several important considerations prompted a number of modifications in this original Scope of Work. Some of these considerations were: (1) a need to integrate the Community Centered, School Centered, and Support Agency Centered Strategies; (2) NIE's growing interest in a successful installation of the integrated strategies; (3) the need to plan a diffusion effort; (4) the impact of unanticipated high inflation rates on budgets; and (5) a 15 percent reduction in NIE funding.

As a result, the Rural Education Program discontinued development of the Learner Centered and Family Centered components and integrated the Community Centered, School Centered, and Support Agency components. Simultaneously, a site (Site A) for installing the integrated strategy was arranged through contracts with the Utah State Board of Education and the San Juan School District in southeastern Utah. The Scope of Work statement also included the procurement of a second field test site by November 30, 1975, (Site B) and the development of an evaluation plan for measuring the extent to which the strategy could produce desired outcomes. In addition, a diffusion planning component was added for 1975.

As of July 1, 1976, the REP had completed the installation of the integrated RFD Strategy in Site A in southeastern Utah; prototype versions of the six products specified in the contract had been developed; the specifications for a seventh product, the Support Agency Guide, had been prepared; a second field test site (Site B) had been procured and installation had begun in northeastern Washington; an evaluation plan for measuring degree of implementation and outcomes had been developed; and a nine-state diffusion effort had been initiated.

2.2 RFD Strategy Description[1]

The Rural Education Program is funded to develop a strategy that will help rural communities and school systems improve local learning opportunities. This strategy, called the Rural Futures Development Strategy, is governed by beliefs that:

- People who are affected by decisions should help make them.
- There are no pat answers to problems--communities and schools should learn how to choose the best solutions to their problems.
- A systematic approach to solving problems helps people make the best use of available time and resources.
- To increase the likelihood that problems will be satisfactorily resolved, participants in decision-making need certain skills.

The RFD Strategy does not provide packaged solutions to rural problems. Rather, it provides a process that encourages local initiative and participation in determining educational change. The strategy has as its goal improved local problem solving through (1) increased control of educational change by community members and school personnel and (2) improved support services for rural schools from state and regional education agencies. The strategy is designed to accomplish its goal by

- providing a comprehensive process by which citizens, school board members, school leaders, school staff members, and students can identify priority problems; select, legitimize, and implement a solution; and evaluate the solution's effectiveness
- providing opportunities for participants to develop skills that will help them contribute to educational change
- helping educational support agencies respond to needs at the local level

A basic component of the strategy is the two-member process facilitator (PF) team that regional educational service agencies provide to local communities and schools. Such teams help people organize themselves and acquire essential problem-solving skills. PF teams work to help school and community groups become effective in identifying and solving problems. They do not tell people what to change, but help them learn how to change.

---

[1]Excerpted from Evaluation Plan Site B, Revised May 1976 (Rural Education Program, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, May 1976).

The integrated RFD Strategy has two foci: support agencies, which are generally state educational agencies and regional educational agencies, and local schools and communities.

2.2.1 Support agencies. One part of the RFD Strategy develops the following procedures and skills in support agencies:

- builds RFD installation capabilities in regional educational service agencies in the state
- supports such capabilities by strengthening the agencies' own ability to solve problems
- facilitates citizen, educator, and student participation in local problem-solving efforts

2.2.2 Local schools and communities. One part of the strategy provides citizens, educators, and students with processes and skills that will help them improve their communication, decision-making, and problem-solving capabilities.

As part of the RFD Strategy, a series of products has been developed for use by the various groups that participate. These products are

The RFD Manual for School-Community Process Facilitators

The RFD Guide for Training Process Facilitators

The RFD Guide for Schools

The RFD Notebook for School-Community Groups

The RFD Guide for School Boards

As of August 1976 the RFD Strategy descriptions and the RFD Guide for Support Agencies were in the process of being developed.

3.0 RFD STRATEGY AS INSTALLED IN SITE A

3.1 Site A Context

In order to understand both the strategy installation and evaluation in Site A one must have some understanding of the context in which both occurred. The following description presents the general characteristics of the site, and is excerpted from the Site A Evaluation Plan.

> Site A is located in a geographically remote area. It is approximately 1,100 miles from Portland, Oregon, and requires, at a minimum, eight hours of travel time to reach. The county in which Site A is located covers 7,799 square miles, an area equivalent in size to the state of New Jersey. Approximately 86 percent of this land is owned by the Federal government.
>
> According to 1970 census figures, the county itself has a population of 9,606 with the following distribution by race:
>
> | | | | |
> |---|---|---|---|
> | White: | 4,826 | Indian: | 4,740 |
> | Negro: | 16 | Other: | 24 |
>
> The Indian population which is Navajo possesses its own language and culture and has remained, to a large extent, isolated from the Anglo community. Many of the community members do not speak English. As a group they are geographically isolated, living in areas accessible only by jeep, with no electrical or phone service. Further, the Indian group itself is not homogenous and contains at least two subgroups that possess different languages and culture patterns.
>
> There are no urban areas in the county. The largest town has a 1970 census population of 2,250. The population of this and the other towns is primarily Anglo, with the majority of county and city government offices being held by them. Additionally, the Anglo community supports a very strong and highly active religious organization.
>
> The largest employer within the county is the Federal government. Other occupations in which a sizeable number of inhabitants are engaged are mining, agriculture, and wholesale and retail trades.

Within this county there exists no regional educational agency. Instead, a single school district serves the entire areas. There are seven elementary schools, one junior high, and two high schools with a total enrollment of approximately 2,700. Additionally, there is a Federally operated Bureau of Indian Affairs school which provides classes for students in grades K-6, and offers vocational training for those up to 21 years of age.

At the time of involvement of the Rural Education Program in Site A, a group of Native American parents and students were threatening to file a class action lawsuit against the school district. Less than three months later the threat became reality, and the district was charged with racial discrimination which resulted in unequal educational opportunities for Native American children. The major allegation of the suit was discrimination which had occurred because of failure to apportion funds on an equal basis, failure to provide a secondary educational facility, as well as other facilities in predominately native areas, and failure to provide a bicultural and bilingual educational program. The school district staff, in their desire to remedy the conditions leading to these charges, lent their support to the implementation of the RFD Strategy. Knowledge of the availability of the strategy as well as initial negotiations for the implementation of it occurred through the offices of Rural Education Program director and the Utah State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

At the time of strategy installation, major factors impacting upon both the strategy and the evaluation of it included (1) the geographic remoteness and extensiveness of the area, (2) the presence of two distinct language and cultural groups, (3) the presence of a strong and powerful Anglo religious organization, and (4) the institution of legal proceedings against the school board responsible for contracting with the REP.

3.2 Description of Strategy as Installed in Site A

The RFD Strategy in Site A may be viewed from two perspectives. The first is that of the REP as it provided training, materials, and support essential to the installation of the strategy. The second is the perspective of the local school district and process facilitators intent upon seeing that critical strategy activities and events were carried out in a manner consistent with the RFD philosophy.

For the Rural Education Program, Site A involvement included:

- providing orientation sessions to the RFD Strategy for the school board and school administrations
- assisting the local school district in setting up criteria for and hiring four process facilitators, and identifying and orienting a local RFD coordinator (the assistant superintendent for secondary education)

- conducting 15 formal training sessions in collaborative problem-solving for the process facilitators and potential State Department of Education trainers

- providing Guided Field Experience, e.g., direct field consultation to process facilitators, initially through the services of an REP staff member living on-site for that purpose, and later through on-site visits of approximately one-week durations of one or two staff members

- supplying materials supportive of strategy installation

For the school district and the process facilitators, implementing the strategy during the 22-month contract period required them to engage in and/or facilitate the occurrence of numerous activities and events which are discussed at length below. In the absence of regional educational agencies in Utah, the local school district was required to play the roles of both a local and an intermediate resource agency.

At the SEA level, the Rural Education Program (REP) staff provided formal training sessions and guided field experience for two and occasionally three Department of Education employees. The purpose of the sessions was to prepare these employees to train future districts and/or agencies. The REP staff also provided consultation and training to the Utah Department of Education Task Force on Community Education.

3.2.1 Formation of the SCGs. One of the initial tasks of the PFs was to assist community members in establishing broadly representative groups of citizens, educators, and students. Two such school-community groups (SCGs) were initially formed, one in the southeastern and one in the southwestern area of the district. Individuals considered to be opinion leaders were nominated for membership on the SCGs by the Navajo chapter groups in both areas and by Anglo community members. The two lists of nominees were submitted to the school board for approval, which was granted. Individuals so named became permanent members of either SCG I or SCG II.

Approximately a year later an additional SCG (SCG III) was formed in the largest town in the central area of the district. Similar procedures for determining group memberships were employed, although there were no Navajo chapter groups in the area to engage in this process. Secondary students from all three SCG areas attended the same junior and senior high school.

3.2.2 Conduct of needs assessment. One of the first tasks of the SCGs was to identify the perceived educational needs of the community members in those areas in which they were operating. This task was accomplished by conducting community wide needs assessments. Survey instruments were developed by the SCGs and administered to local residents. These surveys were designed to collect data which would reflect the extent to which community members perceived the need for high schools located within these communities. This issue had been identified by the two SCGs as the education issue of greatest concern to community members. The survey results were

overwhelmingly supportive of the construction of two high schools, one to serve each of the areas represented by the SCGs. A request for the allocation of funds for the construction of the schools was made to the local school board, and subsequently approved.

3.2.3 Search activities. Following the board's approval, the SCGs began engaging in activities designed to assist them in identifying alternative school programs and school facilities from which appropriate selections for the new high schools could be made. These activities consisted of visits to a number of schools by either task force teams assembled for that purpose, or by the entire SCG, and initial meetings with architects, public building officials, curriculum specialists, and community school representatives. Both groups presented interim search reports to the local school board detailing these activities.

3.2.4 Planning activities. As the SCGs were moving into the planning phase of strategy activities, the school board hired two architects to work with the groups in preparing for the construction of the two high schools. At this time the groups were also engaged in activities designed to assist them in arriving at decisions about the specific site locations for the schools. One SCG undertook an additional survey of the community in order to be able to identify community preferences for the name of the new school. At the time of completion of contract work in Site A, these two SCGs were continuing activities relating to the construction and startup of the new high schools.

SCG III, which started up nearly a year after the first two, conducted a needs assessment survey designed to identify areas of concern relating to the schools. Topics covered by the survey ranged from the degree of satisfaction with the present reading level of children to the degree of support for greater community involvement in educational decision-making. Approximately 900 community members were surveyed and results were tabulated and reported to the school board.

This SCG then formed six task force groups around six concerns identified during the survey. The two most active of these groups, the task forces on extracurricular activities and on teacher performance, reviewed the issues and prepared recommendations which they submitted to the school board. At the time of withdrawal of the REP from Site A, the board had referred the recommendation of the first group to the high school administration, and had approved the recommendations of the second group.

3.2.5 Strategy work with the high school staff. During the early months of strategy installation, the process facilitators provided orientation sessions for the staffs of those schools located in the areas in which the SCGs were operating, as well as for the high school which drew students from those areas. Additionally, the high school staff selected two staff representatives to serve on the two SCGs. These individuals kept the school staff informed about the work which the SCGs were doing.

Approximately eight months into the strategy, the decision was made by REP staff to initiate the "school intervention." Among the objectives identified for this work were the preparation of the staff for the operation of the SCG (SCG III) which would be starting up in the coming six to eight months, and the training of the staff in problem-solving methods and procedures so as to facilitate implementation of SCG identified projects.

Following some initial consultation with the principal, the PF taking responsibility for the school work conducted a demonstration activity with the school staff at a faculty meeting. As a result, a task force of approximately 12 school staff members was formed to continue work on processing the concerns identified during the demonstration activity. This group continued to meet throughout the rest of that school year, focusing on short-term projects which could be implemented before school let out.

As school began in the fall 1975, the task force reconvened and undertook the task of making their group more representative of the school staff. They also generated a new list of concerns which included some of the original and some new issues, and circulated them for faculty and student input and prioritization. During the year they worked on identifying and implementing procedures which would lead to improvements in the areas of communication, attendance and discipline, the school day scheduling, and the use of the lunch and faculty rooms.

As an end-of-year activity the task force conducted a survey of the faculty to determine their degree of satisfaction with the work of that group. Results of that survey revealed that in all improvement areas, the work of the group was seen to be "above average," thus indicating general faculty support for the work of the task force.

The bulk of strategy implementation in Site A centered about the three school-community groups and the staff of one high school. The process facilitators, district administrator, and school board members engaged in many activities supportive of strategy implementation not described here, one example being initial work on the part of two PFs to establish a fourth SCG. No formal training was done with the school board, and little training was provided for school administrators. Thus, the major portions of the strategy examined by the evaluation staff in Site A related to the work with the SCGs and to a lesser extent with the school staff.

In summary, RFD Strategy activities in Site A occurred according to the following timeline. During August of 1974 the RFD staff provided orientation to the local school board and to school administrators and assisted the district in the hiring of four process facilitators. In September formal training of the process facilitators was initiated, and they in turn began activities which culminated in the establishment of two school-community groups. Membership on these two groups was approved by the school board in November. The two SCGs began planning needs assessment activities during November and December and actually conducted the surveys during January of 1975. Following the school

board's positive response to the SCGs' requests for funds to support the construction of two new high schools, the SCGs entered into the search phase of strategy activities. About the same time, April 1975, work began with the school staff to form a task force to examine school-related concerns. This work continued throughout the rest of the school year.

During the fall of 1975 SCG I and SCG II finished up activities of the search phase and began gradually moving into planning activities. The school task force reconvened and undertook a series of tasks which carried them through the school year. At this time the third SCG (SCG III) was formed and began planning its own needs assessment. In November the bond election was held and passed easily.

From January 1976 through June 1976, the time of withdrawal of the REP, SCG I and II were engaged in planning for the construction of the new high schools, SCG III was conducting its needs assessment, making recommendations to the school board, and engaging in search and planning activities. Finally, the school task force continued working to resolve those issues which it had identified earlier.

4.0 DESIGN OF THE EVALUATION

For the Rural Education Program, a primary purpose of the Site A installation was to aid in the formulation of a comprehensive definition of the RFD Strategy, its events and activities. The Site A setting provided the REP with an opportunity to try out for the first time both the school and community components of the integrated strategy. The REP also planned to utilize this field experience in revising the strategy prior to a Site B installation.

In Site A the evaluation was concerned primarily with the monitoring of the RFD Strategy at the local school district level. Thus, few evaluation activities were conducted which involved work with the support agency, in this instance the Utah Department of Education. Results of the evaluation activities which were conducted are reported in a series of informal reports, described subsequently. Since the purpose of the evaluation was not to measure outcomes, but was to assist with the definition of the "treatment" in Site A, the use of either an experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation design was deemed inappropriate. Thus, no comparison groups were included in the Site A evaluation.

The strategy itself was installed in Site A over a 22-month time period. During that time, the evaluation periodically monitored the events, processes, and procedures of the strategy.

At the time of the development of the Site A Evaluation Plan, the evaluation staff believed the bulk of the data could be collected through questionnaires, logs, minutes, and checklists. It was thought that observations and interviews would be employed only on a limited basis, primarily to supplement data collected by other methods. However, it rapidly became clear, through (a) the failure of strategy participants to complete and return questionnaires and/or to maintain logs, minutes and/or checklists; (b) the lack of predictability of the timing and in some instances the sequence of strategy events; and (c) the large number of non-English speaking strategy participants, that the most accurate, timely, and complete data would be those collected through interviews and observations. With the exception of the final Site A evaluation data collection activity, the majority of data was collected by two-person interview teams, interviewing strategy participants individually. Translators were utilized for interviews with non-English speaking individuals.

Plans had also been made to gather data by monitoring and reviewing the use of RFD Strategy products (Guides) as they were used in Site A. The products, as they presently exist, were not introduced into Site A until near completion of the installation activities. Thus no data were obtainable on their use. However, data were collected from the process facilitators on the materials which were

provided on an ongoing basis for their use in Site A. A data collection effort on the products themselves is planned for August or September 1976 by the product developers, and results will be reported by them.

4.1 Questions, Methods and Instrumentation Utilized in the Site A Evaluation

In order to assist the REP in its work of defining and refining the RFD Strategy, the Evaluation Unit, in conjunction with program staff, identified the ten major questions to be answered by the Site A evaluation.

1. *What are the characteristics of Site A at the time of installation of the RFD Strategy?*
2. *What RFD events and/or processes occurred during the installation of the strategy in Site A?*
3. *What were participant reactions to these events and/or processes?*
4. *What gaps or redundancies do participants perceive in the events and/or processes of the strategy?*
5. *What alterations should be made in the RFD Strategy?*
6. *What unanticipated consequences occurred in Site A?*
7. *What direct costs were incurred during the installation of the strategy?*
8. *What is the perception of strategy participants regarding the adequacy of the RFD Strategy to improve the quality of education?*
9. *To what extent do community members perceive themselves to be involved in educational decision-making?*
10. *To what degree do process facilitators possess and practice skills and competencies important to strategy implementation?*

The methods and instruments utilized to obtain data on these questions are detailed on the pages which follow.

4.1.1 *Question No. 1: What are the characteristics of Site A at the time of the installation of the RFD Strategy?* In order to provide the Rural Education Program with a description of Site A, the evaluation staff collected demographic data. The focus of demographic data collection efforts was upon securing information on those institutions, organizations, and communities which would implement the RFD Strategy. This information was used to describe

the populations and institutions. These collection activities consisted mainly of record searches, although some interviewing was used to obtain information which was not available in written form. The Baseline Data Collection Form was utilized for collecting and organizing those data.

4.1.2 *Question No. 2: What RFD events and/or processes occurred in Site A?* In order to provide the Rural Education Program with a description of the RFD Strategy as it occurred in Site A, data were collected concerning which strategy events did or did not occur. For purposes of the evaluation, the January 1975 REP description of anticipated events of the RFD Strategy was used to focus data collection efforts. From that description strategy checklists were developed for the primary participant groups. (For an example of these checklists, see Appendix A.) The process facilitators and REP staff primarily responsible for the Site A installation were asked to complete these forms for the groups with which they had been working. The data which resulted have been written up in Section 3.2 of this report, titled "Description of RFD Strategy as Installed in Site A."

4.1.3 *Question No. 3: What were participant reactions to these events and/or processes?*

4.1.4 *Question No. 4: Which gaps and/or redundancies do participants perceive in the events and/or processes of the strategy?*

4.1.5 *Question No. 5: What alterations should be made in the strategy, events, or processes?*

Questions No. 3, No. 4, and No. 5 are grouped together here because the same methods, procedures, and instrumentation were utilized for data gathering on all three issues. Data were collected through interviews with strategy participants during seven site visits made by two-member evaluation teams. An open-ended interview schedule format was used, and each participant was interviewed individually. (For a sample interview schedule see Appendix A.) Data collected in this manner were reported to the REP in a series of informal reports. Procedures and results of this data collection are detailed in Section 5.1 of this report, titled "Input for Strategy Refinement."

4.1.6 *Question No. 6: What unanticipated consequences occurred in Site A?* One of the purposes of the evaluation in Site A was to provide the Rural Education Program with information on the occurrence of unanticipated consequences of strategy implementation. However, as the strategy installation progressed, it became more and more difficult to determine which were and which were not anticipated outcomes. This was due, in part, to such factors as the incomplete installation of the strategy and the political and cultural idiosyncrasies of this site. Thus, the evaluation staff abandoned this task in favor of those more likely to produce beneficial results, given the costs incurred.

4.1.7 *Question No. 7: What direct costs were incurred during the installation of the strategy?* In order to assist the Rural Education Program in the development of the strategy, and in order to be able to provide interested clients with an estimate of the direct costs involved in installation of the RFD Strategy, the Evaluation Unit monitored the amount of time and travel expenses of personnel directly responsible for strategy installation. Data were collected from REP budget printouts and from school district staff. Results are reported in Section 5.6 of this report.

Over the period of strategy installation, approximately 22 months, the following additional questions were identified for inclusion in a final data gathering effort.

4.1.8 *Question No. 8: What is the perception of strategy participants regarding the adequacy of the RFD Strategy to improve the quality of education?*

4.1.9 *Question No. 9: To what degree do community members perceive themselves to be involved in educational decision-making?*

4.1.10 *Question No. 10: To what degree do process facilitators possess and practice skills and competencies important to strategy implementation?*

In order to obtain data on these three questions, a "school and Community Questionnaire" was mailed out to both strategy participants and community members. Additionally, a readily translatable form of the same questionnaire was orally administered to non-English speaking participants and community members by Navajo translators.

Data on process facilitator skills were also collected utilizing a Process Facilitator Rating form, which was completed by the process facilitators who rated themselves and each other. Also, RFD specialists and program installers working closely with the PFs were asked to provide ratings on the four PFs. Data obtained in this manner were provided to the REP staff at a program meeting held for that purpose.

5.0 EVALUATION RESULTS

5.1 Input for Strategy Refinement

In accordance with the procedures outlined in the Site A Evaluation Plan, reporting of evaluation findings during the course of the strategy installation was accomplished through a series of informal reports. These reports were prepared following each site visit and data collection activity of the evaluation staff. In all, a total of 10 memos and/or reports were presented to the Rural Education Program over the course of the 22 months of strategy installation.

The reports were written as inhouse documents, for use by the Rural Education Program in making changes and/or adjustments in the strategy processes. Circulation of these reports was restricted to the REP. This was done for three reasons. First, the data which were collected focused on issues which would assist the REP in refining the strategy, rather than on issues related to strategy outcomes. Thus, the data were of relatively little interest to either the school district, the Utah Department of Education, or the National Institute of Education (N.I.E.). Second, because the evaluation was focused on strategy implementation rather than strategy outcomes, the data which were reported came from those most closely involved with the strategy, and thus from a comparatively small group. While data from these small groups did provide issues for examination by the REP, they did not support generalizations beyond the specific setting. As such, they could be of little value to other than program staff. Finally, reporting internally allowed the evaluation unit to obtain data from program staff as well as those responsible for implementing the strategy without being viewed as program monitors. It was made clear to all that the intent of the evaluation was to improve the strategy, and that it was not to pass judgment on any individual or group.

Informal reports were prepared following each major data collection activity. As previously reported, the bulk of the data were collected through interviews with strategy participants. Following data collection activities which, in all but one instance, consisted of visits to the installation site, the two evaluators involved would identify from the data major issues to be included in the reports. Occasionally, disagreements occurred between the evaluators as to the interpretation of various pieces of data. When this occurred, the data and related issues were earmarked for further investigation during future data collection activities. Using this technique insured that the interpretation of data reported to the REP was supported by more than a single individual.

Confidentiality of respondents was maintained in all instances. Where a person's position might be reflected by the nature of his comments, individuals were given the option of having their comments recorded. No comments delivered "off the record" were finally reported.

Issues were most frequently grouped according to the specific target group affected, such as Process Facilitators, SCG, School Task Force, etc. However, in some cases issues extended across more than one group. When this occurred, they were so cited. For each major issue and concern, the evaluators presented recommendations which provided one potential solution or a procedure for arriving at a solution to the identified issue. The quality of the recommendations put forth by the evaluators varied considerably. Even the most limited and least insightful recommendations were of value in that they served to generate extensive issue examination and discussion among the REP staff. The recommendations seen as most helpful by the REP staff were those that provided reasonable and appropriate solutions and which were based on knowledge which was seen as unique to the evaluation staff.

Finally, in preparing and presenting both issues and recommendations, the evaluation staff focused on those items which appeared to have implications for Site A installation and beyond.

Data collected by the evaluation unit over the 22-month period of strategy installation centered about four main topics: Installation of the RFD Strategy, Roles and Responsibilities of Strategy Participants, Training Needs of Strategy Participants, and RFD Strategy Description and Definition. A summary of the recommendations presented in the informal reports is contained in the paragraphs which follow.

5.1.1 Strategy installation. Several issues were identified which related to the manner in which the Rural Education Program conducted the strategy installation: installation here being defined as formal and informal training, technical assistance and consultation designed to provide clients with the capacity to implement the RFD Strategy. This information confirmed the program's belief that proper treatment of these issues is essential to success.

One issue identified by the Evaluation Unit pertained to the manner in which the initial strategy activities, e.g., the "entry" activities, were conducted. It was emphasized that those groups and individuals who would be affected by the decision to accept the RFD Strategy must be involved in that decision. Since this is a basic tenet of the RFD Strategy, the recommendation was that the RFP, in future installations, be particularly careful not to violate it.

A second recommendation, and one related to the first, concerned the necessity for the REP to obtain the commitment of the school board to a clearly established set of agreements relating to resources, personnel, and group involvement. This recommendation arose out of (1) the need on the part of the process facilitators for legitimation

from the school board of their role within the school district, and (2) the need for clarity between the REP and the school board with respect to the provision of training for the school board itself.

An important aspect of strategy installation is the work which the REP does with a local education agency (LEA) to assist the agency in implementing the strategy. Within the context of the Site A experience, the need was identified for the REP to work closely with LEA staff, in this instance the school district, to ensure that procedures which would promote the coordination of implementation activities and the flow of communication among strategy participants would be established. A recommendation to that effect was made by the Evaluation Unit to the REP.

Part of the guided field experience (GFE) in Site A was provided by a member of the REP installation staff who lived onsite during the initial eight months of the strategy installation. The response was positive from those responsible for implementing the strategy in Site A to the question of the necessity of that position both in Site A and in future sites. Thus, the recommendation was made that the REP seriously consider providing an onsite installer for the initial stages of strategy implementation in future sites. Another GFE issue that surfaced during the Site A installation centers about the identification of, and agreement upon, the locus of responsibility for the conduct of GFE. At the time of the program's intervention in Site A, it was generally felt that the responsibility for GFE would shift to State Department of Education employees who had been trained in the strategy processes and procedures. Several difficulties with this plan were encountered, and the REP continued to provide the bulk of the GFE throughout the contract period. The issue, however, of when responsibility for GFE shifts, and to whom it shifts, is one which was not resolved in the Site A experience. A final recommendation relating to strategy installation was made which alerted the REP staff to the need to refrain from becoming involved in promoting their own solutions to onsite problems.

The Rural Education Program undertook consideration of these recommendations as they proceeded with the installation of the RFD Strategy in the second site.

5.1.2 Roles and responsibilities of strategy participants. A recurring need identified throughout the Site A experience was for more information to be given to strategy participants regarding strategy roles, role relationships, and role responsibilities. This need was identified for participants at all levels of the strategy, from SCG members to PFs to the RFD coordinator. Specifically, process facilitators should provide SCG members with materials describing their roles and responsibilities as SCG officers and representatives. Data were also collected which indicated confusion about the relationships of the SCGs to each other and to other local organizations. The evaluation staff recommended that guidelines be provided which would outline SCG functions and relationships with respect to those local organizations operating in the same content and geographic areas as the SCGs.

The roles of the PF and the concept of the PF team were additional aspects of the strategy to which attention was drawn by the Site A situation. Initially, the PFs were confused about the nature of their role and the actual tasks which a PF performs. As the role of a PF became clearer, questions began to emerge about the concept of a PF team and the relation of PF team members. At this point the evaluation staff recommended that the REP examine the strategy as it relates to the PF's role and role relationships, and clarify for them, to the extent possible, what these should be. The issue of PF teaming is one which was raised in Site A, but one which for a number of reasons could not be resolved by the Site A experience alone. Again, within the context of Site A, the need was identified for information relating to the role of RFD coordinator and particularly for clarity with respect to the amount of time and personal commitment necessary for strategy implementation.

In response to these recommendations the Rural Education Program prepared and circulated role descriptions to field staff for the use of the primary strategy participants.

5.1.3 Training needs of strategy participants. A major focus of the training needs identified by evaluation staff during the Site A installation concerned training of the process facilitators. Recommendations were made on topics ranging from the need for structuring of PF formal training sessions to the generic type of training to be provided to the PFs. One need identified in the early stages of strategy installation was for a comprehensive orientation session for all those responsible for implementing RFD. It was recommended that content for this session include a clear and detailed explication of the RFD Strategy, a focus on the goals and philosophy of RFD, a discussion of the procedures which the strategy employs, and finally a clear presentation of the implications for all community members of the strategy adoption. Another recommendation was for the inclusion of PETC[2] (Preparing Educational Training Consultants) training and the communication skills training provided in the "October Workshop," a special training session focused primarily upon communication skills, although there was no agreement as to when during the series of training these would best be scheduled.

A number of different recommendations were made concerning specific types of training to be provided the PFs. These included training which would assist PFs in transferring the skills they themselves have to the community members and school staff they were working with, training which would help them in resolving their own interpersonal conflicts, and training in the technical aspects of the conduct of a needs assessment. With respect to the latter

---

[2]This workshop has been developed by the Improving Teaching Competencies Program of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. It is designed to help individuals work with small groups through an improvement of their skills in problem-solving, communication, and decision making.

recommendation, an alternative suggestion, that the PFs be assisted in locating consultant help with the technical details of the needs assessment, was also made. However, on the subject of using a consultant, the evaluation staff suggested that within training sessions the PFs be assisted in learning to identify (1) those situations when the use of a consultant can be profitable and (2) consultants possessing the necessary skills as well as familiarity with the problems under consideration.

At the time of the Site A installation, the work to be done with the schools, the timing of it, and the responsibility for it, were not clearly defined. As the school work began to unfold, discomfort was expressed by the PFs with their lack of knowledge about and understanding of that work. Thus, at one point the recommendation was made that training sessions which were to follow focus on work with the schools, and that supportive materials will be provided for that purpose. Additionally, as one PF emerged in the position of responsibility for that work, it became clear that the other three PFs were not receiving the same training experiences. The recommendation was then made that all PFs be trained in all aspects of strategy installation.

A final recommendation with respect to the formal training sessions for PFs was for a format which would provide ample opportunity for involvement of trainees as well as trainers, and that the amount of time spent on lecturing-type activities be kept to a minimum.

Two training needs were identified for the school board. The first was that they be educated very early in the strategy installation as to the goals, philosophy, processes and implications of the strategy. The second was that the school board be assisted in gaining skills in identifying, utilizing, and interpreting the data for decision making. This recommendation emerged from the need of the school board to be able to respond to the results of SCG data collection activities, such as the needs assessments.

These recommendations were reviewed by the staff of REP installers and alterations were made in the training plans for the Site A work. Additionally, these recommendations were considered by staff responsible for planning the training in the second RFD site, Site B.

5.1.4 RFD Strategy description and definition. At the onset of strategy installation in Site A, the evaluation staff identified what appeared to be a critical need for materials for staff participants which adequately described the RFD Strategy. Specifically, two types of materials were recommended. One set would be primarily informational and could be used by participants called upon to present the strategy to others. A package presentation addressing the purposes, procedures, and implications of strategy adoption was recommended as the format for these materials. The second set would be more than informational, and would explain in detail the steps necessary for strategy implementation. These materials would provide key strategy participants with a description of the specific activities and events

which are to take place as a community becomes involved in carrying out the RFD Strategy.

Concerning the definition of the strategy, two specific recommendations were made. The first dealt with the need for the REP to make explicit the definition of needs assessment which it employs, and to see that the definition is accurately reflected in the strategy materials. The second proposed that the REP examine the extent to which the RFD Strategy provides methods, skills, and support for the facilitation of communication among SCGs, the community, and task force groups. The second part to this recommendation suggested that the REP examine the processes by which these methods, skills, and support are shared with the PF, and the extent to which the PFs are prepared for transferring the procedures and skills to the groups with which they're working.

Since these recommendations were made, the REP staff has completed and revised a strategy description and package presentation, and examined the issue of preparing process facilitators to transfer skills to community members.

5.1.5 Miscellaneous recommendations. During the evaluation of the Site A strategy installation, several issues emerged which do not fall into any readily identifiable category, but do have implications for strategy revision. They are presented in the following paragraphs, A and B.

5.1.A. Strategy products and materials. The RFD Strategy products were not completed in time for use in Site A. However, many of the materials which were ultimately incorporated into the products were used in either the formal training or the guided field experience in Site A. It was difficult to obtain specific recommendations regarding the materials, although trainees did report that materials were generally more helpful to them if they had them to look over prior to the training sessions. One early general criticism of the materials was that they contained too much jargon and were written on too scholarly a level. A final recommendation relating to materials was that those materials which were designed for use in training sessions and field activities be used in accordance with the specifications provided by developers.

The REP development staff members are preparing to revise products during 1977, with final products completed by November 1977.

5.1.B. Management of the RFD Strategy. Two issues which emerged during the Site A experience related to practical problems encountered in managing the installation of the strategy. The first centered about the need for placing all PFs under the same contractual obligations and responsibilities, as well as similar salaries and benefits. The second concerned office space, and the evaluation staff recommended that PFs be provided with permanent working space from which they could plan, organize, and coordinate their work in the communities and the schools.

The final two recommendations related to the operation of the strategy in the field. One recommendation proposed that needs assessment activities be scheduled within a timeframe which permitted the completion of the activities without undue time pressure on strategy participants. The other suggested that, in bilingual sites, SCGs make provisions for designated individuals to serve as official translators for the groups. It was cautioned that these individuals not be process facilitators because of the role conflicts that might arise. These recommendations were taken into consideration by REP staff as they prepared for the Site B strategy installation.

5.1.6 Summary of strategy refinement procedure. The evaluation staff, through the medium of informal reports, provided the Rural Education Program with data and recommendations from the Site A experience. These data and recommendations served as stimuli for examination of the RFD Strategy and issues related to the implementation of it. Combined with the experiences of program installers, the evaluation results were utilized to revise the RFD Strategy description on a phase-by-phase basis, as well as to make changes and/or alterations in the strategy as it was being installed.

5.2 Response of Strategy Participants and Community Members to the RFD Strategy

In June of 1976 a survey was conducted of strategy participants and community members living in the areas served by the SCGs. Groups surveyed included the three School-Community Groups, the school staff and school task force, the school board and community members from three areas. (A copy of the survey questionnaire is presented in Appendix A.2.)

5.2.1 Survey procedures. Questionnaires were mailed to all English-speaking SCG members, to the school staff, and to school board members. Fifty community members were selected at random from one community's phonebook to receive questionnaires. For the other two communities, no listing of community members was available. Postal employees in both of these areas agreed to distribute questionnaires to English-speaking members of their community. Approximately 60 questionnaires were distributed in this manner. Respondents were asked to complete the questionnaires and return them by mail to the county library. Completed questionnaires were collected from the library on a daily basis, with telephone follow-up being conducted for those respondents who could be identified and who had phone service. As a result of the follow-up, an additional 14 questionnaires were sent out. Some were sent as replacements for those which had either been misplaced or had not been received by the respondent. Because of the low initial response rate, an additional 22 persons were sent questionnaires in an attempt to increase the number of responses.

Since approximately half of the Site A population is non-English speaking, arrangements were made with two translators, both Native Americans, to conduct interviews with non-English speaking SCG and community members in their respective areas. In addition to the SCG interview, each translator agreed to interview 30 community members from their area, for a total of 60 interviews. However, only one translator completed the task of interviewing the SCG members and community members. Therefore, the response of the Native Americans reported in subsequent sections of this report will be those for the area served by SCG I only.

5.2.2 Limitations of the data. In reviewing the data contained in subsequent sections of this report, the reader should keep in mind the following limitations. First, there is the problem of response bias of those completing the questionnaire. It is generally assumed that those who respond to mail-out surveys represent elements of the population which have the most interest in the issues on which information is being collected. The data which result can therefore be considered to reflect the extremes of opinions, rather than reflecting all points along the spectrum. This effect may have been somewhat reduced by utilizing the follow-up technique of telephone contact of nonrespondents.

The low response rate further contributes to the problem of response bias. While the initial sample size was low (a total of 331 out of district population of 9,600), the extremely low response rate (approximately 41%[3]) served to further reduce the already limited sample. Thus, attempts to generalize from these data to either all community members or to the non-responding members of the groups surveyed should be done with a great deal of caution.

A third limitation derives from the nature of the data themselves. The questionnaire consisted of self-report items, including respondents' perceptions of change over time. While no attempts were made to determine the reliability of these specific data, data of this type do not generally produce reliable results. There is no reason to believe these data are exceptions.

Another limitation to the data results from combining the responses of those belonging to different groups and living in different communities. Specifically, data from SCG members completing the questionnaire, whether they were members of SCG I, SCG II, or SCG III, were analyzed together. Further, data from community members living in areas served by three different SCGs were combined. Thus, whatever differences may exist among communities were washed out by the data analysis.

---

[3]Figure includes both English and non-English speaking.

A final note of caution must be added regarding the interpretation of the midpoint of the five-point scales utilized for Questions A-4 through A-8. Since these were undefined on the questionnaires, it is impossible to determine exactly how they were interpreted by respondents. In order to discuss these points within this report, however, definitions were added. While they do offer degree differences, they may not reflect the same interpretations applied by some or all respondents.

5.3 Survey Results

The survey was designed to obtain from both strategy participants and community members their perceptions of involvement in and the quality of educational decision making in their school district. Since the school-community groups (SCGs) had been operating for approximately 20 months in two of the three areas, the survey also included items which would provide an indication of the extent to which respondents perceived a change in the last two years.

The paragraphs which follow present the results of that survey for the most significant questions posed. Each section contains a table presenting the data related to a specific item followed by a discussion of those data.

5.3.1 Improvement in the quality of education decisions. Respondents were asked if the overall quality of decisions about education in their community had improved in the last two years. A five-point scale was provided for their response. On the scale 1 = not at all and 5 = a great deal. Points 2, 3, and 4 were not defined. In order to facilitate discussion within this paper, they are being defined as 2 = "slightly," 3 = "somewhat," and 4 = "considerably." The table on the following page contains the responses, both actual numbers and percents for combined SCGs, school task force, school staff, school board, and a sampling of community members from the three areas.

Nearly three-quarters of the 77 respondents to this question thought that the quality of education decisions in their community in the last two years had improved at least "somewhat" and as much as "a great deal." Of the remaining 26% answering this question, 6.5% thought there had been slight improvement and 19.5% felt that there had been no improvement at all.

In order to determine whether there was a difference by respondent groups in how decision making was viewed, we analyzed the data by the following categories: SCG members, school task force members, school staff members, school board members, and community members. Of the 26% who had seen no, or little, improvement over the past two years, 21% were community members and 5% were school staff members. All SCG members, school task force members, and school board members who responded to this item, as well as 80% of the school staff and 54% of the community members saw improvement ranging from some to a great deal.

Table I

Has the Overall Quality of Decisions About Education in Your Community in the Last Two Years Improved?

Response Group	SCGs		School Task Force		School Staff		School Board		Community Members		Total Surveyed	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Possible No.	38		12		52		6		156		264	
Not at all (1)	0	(0)	0	(0)	3	(15)	0	(0)	12	(34.3)	15	(19.5)
Slightly (2)	0	(0)	0	(0)	1	(5)	0	(0)	4	(11.4)	5	(6.5)
Some-what (3)	7	(50)	1	(25)	5	(25)	1	(25)	7	(20.0)	21	(27.3)
Consider-ably (4)	4	(28.6)	1	(25)	7	(35)	3	(75)	6	(17.1)	21	(27.3)
A great deal (5)	3	(21.4)	2	(50)	4	(20)	0	(0)	6	(17.1)	15	(19.5)
Tot. No.	14		4		20		4		35		77	

Of the five groups responding to this item, those with the least exposure to the RFD Strategy were the school staff and community members. One possible conclusion to be drawn from these data, then, is that those groups which were most closely involved with the strategy thought there was the most improvement in the quality of decisions made relating to education in their district.

5.3.2 Improvement in the quality of education in the community as a result of work done by the school-community groups and school staff. The table on the following page presents the data collected from respondents regarding their perceptions of the extent to which the quality of education in their community had improved as a result of the work done by the school-community groups and the school staff.

A review of these data reveals that a total of 68% of those surveyed felt that the work done by the SCG and school staff with the process facilitators had improved the quality of education at least "somewhat." Of these respondents, 40% felt there had been "considerable" to "a great deal" of positive change. Of those who felt the work of the SCGs and school staff had not improved education in their community, 21.5% of those responding, three were school staff members and eleven

were community members. Again, it is those who are least involved with the strategy who see the least overall improvement in education in their community.

Table II

Has the Work Done by the School-Community Groups (SCGs) and the School Staff with the Process Facilitators Improved the Quality of Education in Your Community?

Response Group	SCGs		School Task Force		School Staff		School Board		Community Members		Total Surveyed	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Possible No.	38		12		52		6		156		264	
Not at all (1)	0	(0)	0	(0)	3	(16.7)	0	(0)	11	(40.7)	14	(21.5)
Slightly (2)	1	(8.3)	0	(0)	1	(5.6)	0	(0)	5	(18.5)	7	(10.8)
Somewhat (3)	5	(41.7)	3	(75)	4	(22.2)	2	(50)	4	(14.8)	18	(27.7)
Considerably (4)	4	(33.3)	1	(25)	8	(44.4)	2	(50)	3	(11.1)	18	(27.7)
A great deal (5)	2	(16.7)	0	(0)	2	(11.1)	0	(0)	4	(14.8)	8	(12.3)
Tot. No.	12		4		18		4		27		65	

5.3. Perception of involvement in educational decision making. Another item on the June 1976 questionnaire asked respondents to indicate if they perceived an increase in their own involvement in educational decision making within the last two years, if their involvement had stayed the same, or if their involvement had decreased. The following table contains these data.

Of the 91 individuals responding, only 7, or 8%, felt that their involvement had decreased. All 7 of these respondents were community members. The remaining respondents were equally divided in their perceptions about involvement with 46% feeling it had "increased." Of the 46% who felt their involvement had stayed the same, 11% were school staff members and 32% were community members. Thus, all SCG members but one and all school task force members responding did see their

involvement in educational decision making increasing. It is interesting to note that 3 of 5 school board members who might be assumed to have been highly involved two years ago saw their own involvement increasing.

Table III

Would You Say Your Involvement in Making Decisions About the Schools During the Past Two Years Has Increased, Stayed the Same, Decreased?

Response Group	SCGs		School Task Force		School Staff		School Board		Community Members		Total Surveyed	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Possible No.	38		12		52		[illegible]		156		264	
Increased	12	(92.3)	5	(100.0)	13	(56.5)	3	(60.0)	9	(20.0)	42	(46.2)
Stayed the same	1	(7.7)	0	(0)	10	(43.5)	2	(40.0)	29	(64.4)	42	(46.2)
Decreased	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	7	(15.6)	7	(7.7)
Tot. No.	13		5		23		5		45		91	

5.3.4 Satisfaction with educational decisions. All respondents were asked if their own satisfaction with decisions relating to the schools had increased, stayed the same, or decreased during the past two years. Thirty-seven percent (n=34) reported increased satisfaction, 32.6% (n=30) reported their satisfaction had stayed the same, and 30.4% (n=28) reported that their satisfaction had actually decreased. These data were also examined by respondent group. They are presented in the table which follows.

Again, it is clear from the data that it is primarily members of the school staff and the community whose satisfaction with decisions relating to the schools during the past two years has either remained the same or decreased.

Table IV

Has Your Satisfaction with Decisions Which Are Made About the Schools During the Past Two Years Increased, Stayed the Same, Decreased?

Response Group	SCGs		School Task Force		School Staff		School Board		Community Members		Total Surveyed	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Possible No.	38		12		52		6		156		264	
Increased	9	(69.2)	3	(60.0)	9	(37.5)	4	(80.0)	9	(20.0)	34	(37)
Stayed the same	2	(15.4)	2	(40.0)	8	(33.3)	1	(20.0)	17	(37.8)	30	(33)
Decreased	2	(15.4)	0	(0)	7	(29.2)	0	(0)	19	(42.2)	28	(30)
Tot. No.	13		5		24		5		45		92	

5.3.5 Involvement of other community members. In order to determine if respondents saw a change in community involvement in education decision making, we asked them if they perceived an increase or decrease in the involvement of other community members, or if, in their opinion, involvement of others had stayed the same.

Of the 72 individuals responding to this question, 48 or two-thirds felt there had been an increase in the involvement of community members in the educational decision-making process. Nineteen persons, or 26%, thought others were involved to about the same extent. Of this 26%, the majority (13) were community members. Further, 7%, or 5 community members, saw a decrease in community involvement. It is clear from the data that those SCG, school task force, school staff and school board members see community members as becoming more involved than community members see themselves. Further, community members formed the only group noting a decrease in involvement. Overall, however, two-thirds of those responding thought there had been an increase in the involvement of community members in the making of decisions about the schools.

Table V

Would You Say the Involvement of Other Members of Your Community in Making the Decisions About the Schools in the Past Two Years Has Increased, Stayed the Same, Decreased?

Response Group	SCGs		School Task Force		School Staff		School Board		Community Members		Total Surveyed	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Possible No.	38		12		52		6		156		264	
Increased	12	(92.3)	4	(80)	14	(77.8)	5	(100)	13	(41.9)	48	(66.7)
Stayed the same	1	(7.7)	1	(20)	4	(22.2)	0	(0)	13	(41.9)	19	(26.4)
Decreased	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	5	(16.1)	5	(6.9)
Tot. No.	13		5		18		5		31		72	

5.3.6 Awareness of school staff, school board, and community members. Respondents were asked to indicate on a 5-point scale (1 = not at all aware, 5 = very aware) how aware they felt school staff, school board, and community members were of their opinions about the school in September of 1974, and in June of 1976. The following table presents a summary of those data.

From the following table, it can clearly be seen that overall, respondents perceived an increase in the awareness of all three groups over the 22-month period. The mean ratings increased .61 for school staff, .75 for school board, and .85 for community members.

Table VI

How Aware Do You Think School Staff Members, School Board Members, and Community Members Were of Your Opinions About the School in September 1974? How Aware Are They Now?

	School Staff		School Board		Community Members	
	1974	1976	1974	1976	1974	1976
Not at all aware (1)	25.3	12.3	36.5	19.0	32.9	14.5
Slightly (2)	10.7	6.2	21.6	12.7	26.0	7.9
Somewhat (3)	25.3	22.2	13.5	20.3	20.5	34.2
Considerably (4)	13.3	23.5	13.5	21.5	12.3	27.6
Very aware (5)	25.3	35.8	14.9	26.5	8.2	15.8
Total No.	75	81	74	79	73	76
Mean	3.03	3.64	2.49	3.24	2.37	3.22
Median	3.05	3.90	2.13	3.41	2.16	3.31

5.3.7 Awareness of the RFD Strategy. In order to determine the extent to which both those involved with the strategy and non-involved community members were aware of the presence of the RFD Strategy in Site A, subjects were asked to respond to two questions. The first question asked respondents, "How aware are you of the work that the school-community group has done with the process facilitators?" The second asked respondents how aware they were of work the school staff had done with the process facilitators. The two tables which follow present these two groups of data.

Exactly half of the 88 respondents reported that they were pretty much to very aware of the school-community work. Slightly over a third (37.3%), however, reported that they were not at all aware of this work. These data are particularly interesting when broken down by respondent groups. As may be guessed, those groups most closely connected with the strategy groups indicated higher levels of awareness than those further removed. For example, all SCG members, all school task force members, and all school board members surveyed reported that they were pretty much aware to very aware of the work being done with the school-community groups. Conversely, 60% of the community members said they were not at all or only slightly aware of the school-community work; 16% indicated that they were somewhat aware, and 23% were pretty much to very aware. Slightly over half of the school staff (52%) indicated they were pretty much to very aware of this work, but another 26% indicated they were not at all aware, or only slightly aware.

Table VII

How Aware Are You of the Work that the School-Community Group Has Done with the Process Facilitators?

Response Group	SCGs		School Task Force		School Staff		School Board		Community Members		Total Surveyed	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Possible No.	38		12		52		6		156		264	
Not at all aware (1)	0	(0)	0	(0)	4	(17.4)	0	(0)	20	(46.5)	24	(37.3)
Slightly (2)	0	(0)	0	(0)	2	(8.7)	0	(0)	6	(14)	8	(9.1)
Somewhat (3)	0	(0)	0	(0)	5	(21.7)	0	(0)	7	(16.3)	12	(13.6)
Consider-ably (4)	1	(7.7)	3	(60.0)	5	(21.7)	1	(25.0)	4	(9.3)	14	(15.9)
Very aware (5)	12	(92.3)	2	(40.0)	7	(30.4)	3	(75.0)	6	(14)	30	(34.1)
Total No.	13		5		23		4		43		88	

Table VIII

How Aware Are You of the Work the School Staff Has Done with the Process Facilitators?

Response Group	SCGs		School Task Force		School Staff		School Board		Community Members		Total Surveyed	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Possible No.	38		12		52		6		156		264	
Not at all aware (1)	0	(0)	0	(0)	2	(8.7)	0	(0)	26	(60.5)	28	(31.1)
Slightly (2)	1	(6.7)	0	(0)	4	(17.4)	0	(0)	2	(4.7)	7	(7.8)
Somewhat (3)	4	(26.7)	0	(0)	2	(8.7)	1	(25.0)	4	(9.3)	11	(12.2)
Consider-ably (4)	6	(40.0)	0	(0)	6	(26.1)	1	(25.0)	6	(14.0)	19	(21.1)
Very aware (5)	4	(26.7)	5	(100.0)	9	(39.1)	2	(50.0)	5	(11.6)	25	(27.8)
Total No.	15		5		23		4		43		90	

The same question was asked regarding the work PFs had done with the school staff. Overall responses were much the same, with 39% of 90 respondents indicating they were not at all or only slightly aware.

Examining these data by groups, one finds that all school task force members, as would be expected, are very aware of the school work and 65% of the school staff are pretty much to very aware of this work. What is surprising, however, is that slightly over one-quarter (26%) of the school staff responding to the survey indicated that they were not at all, or only slightly aware of the work the process facilitator was doing in the school.

Community members were generally uninformed, with 65% indicating they were not at all or only slightly aware of the school work, and another 9% indicating they were somewhat aware. The remaining 26% were almost evenly divided in being pretty much to very aware of the process facilitator work in the school.

5.4 Response of the Navajo Population

As previously described, some thirty Navajo community members and seven Navajo SCG members were interviewed regarding community and SCG involvement in education. Community members were asked about their awareness of the work being done by the SCG and the extent to which that work had helped improve education for students in their community. Responses of community members are presented below.

Table IX

	Yes	No	?	Total
Do you know about the work the school-community group has done?	23	5	3	31
Has the school-community group helped more people in your community make decisions about the education of your children?	26	3	2	31
Has the SCG helped improve education for students in your community?	28	1	2	31

From the responses it can be seen that, of those Navajos surveyed, over 80% thought the SCG had served to increase the participation of community members and had helped to improve the education of students. The reader should note, however, what may be inconsistencies in these data. For example, while 28 of 31 community members felt the SCG had helped improve student education, only 23 of 31 knew about the work of the SCG.

Another series of questions posed Navajo community members related to awareness by teachers, school board members, and community members of the opinions of Navajo people about the schools. The specific questions and the results obtained follow.

Table X

	Yes	No	?	Total
Do teachers know what you think about the schools?	25	5	1	31
Do school board members know what you think about the schools?	20	8	3	31
Do other members of your community know what you think about the schools?	24	6	1	31

An examination of the data reveals that at least two-thirds of the 31 Navajos interviewed thought teachers, school board members and other community members were aware of their opinions about the schools. Of the three groups, school board members were seen as the least knowledgeable of their opinions relating to the schools.

The second group of Navajos surveyed were the non-English speaking members of SCG I. They were asked three questions relating to the success of the school-community groups. Those questions and their responses are presented below.

Table XI

	Yes	No	?	Total
Do you think the SCG has helped improve the education of students in your community?	6	0	1	7
Do you think the SCG has helped the people in your community become more involved with the schools?	7	0	0	7
Has your SCG been successful?	7	0	0	7

From the responses it is clear that, like the Navajo community members, these SCG members view the SCG as successful in both increasing the involvement of community members in issues related to the schools and in improving the education of students in their community.

A note of caution regarding the interpretation of these data must be added. Although an English speaking Navajo consultant was utilized to assist in the construction of the instrument, and specifically in the wording of items, the extent to which the questions were translated in the same terms for all respondents cannot be determined. Nor can it be determined that respondents understood

the questions which were being posed. The extent to which these items and the resulting data serve as valid and reliable measures of Navajo opinion has not been determined.

5.5 Summary of Survey

In general, the results of the survey conducted in June 1976, 22 months after the initial steps of strategy installation, reveal that community members who were surveyed perceive an improvement in the quality of education in their communities over the past two years. Further, respondents on the whole felt themselves to be more involved in the educational decision making, and were generally more satisfied with those decisions which were being made. Finally, two-thirds of the respondents perceived that the work done by the SCGs and the school staff had improved the quality of educational decisions in their communities.

5.6 Direct Costs of Strategy Implementation

Direct costs of the installation of the RFD Strategy were examined from the perspective of the Rural Education Program and the school district. Categories for the REP included (1) amount of time spent in formal training, guided field experience (GFE), and consultation; and (2) travel and per diem costs of providing formal training, GFE, and consultation.

These costs, of course, do not reflect the actual cost of strategy implementation at the local level in Site A. For example, the REP currently figures that for a day of field time, two-thirds to one day of inhouse time is spent in preparation. Doubling the amount of time and salary still do not account for such expenses as space, equipment, supplies, and overhead (such as management costs). Additionally, since Site A was for the REP part of an ongoing strategy development effort, the expenses incurred do not reflect expenses of implementing an already defined and developed strategy. Thus, as examination of all the installation cost data related to the Site A intervention would most likely provide an inflated picture of what strategy implementation costs are for the agency providing the consultation.

The following figures represent the costs for the on-site work of installing the RFD Strategy.

Table XII

		Person Days	Rate	Cost
A.	Contract Negotiations with School District (Start-up)	20	122[4]	$ 2,420.00
B.	Orientation and Formal ining	75	120[5]	9,000.00
C.	Guided Field Experience (GFE)	154	108[6]	16,632.00
D.	Travel Costs for A-C			8,330 00
		Total		$36,382.00

For the school district, figures were provided for salaries of four process facilitators, travel of the facilitators, and SCG members[7], and the contract with NWREL. The district staff in figuring costs for implementing the strategy did not account for the time of the RFD coordinator, superintendent, school board, school staff, and/or task force, and SCG members. Nor did they figure into their expenditure estimates of the cost of providing office space and materials to support the work of the PFs.

The following are the figures reported to us by the school district implementing the RFD Strategy in Site A.

Table XIII

		1974	1975	Total
A.	Salaries for 4 Process Facilitators	$39,000	$54,000	$ 93,000
B.	Travel Expenses for Process Facilitators and SCG Members II	21,000	30,000[8]	51,000
C.	Contract with NWREL for Training, GFE and Consultation	32,000	33,000	65,000
			Total	$109,000

---

[4]Average daily rate for persons involved (salary plus benefits).

[5]Approximate daily rate for program associate (salary plus benefits).

[6]Approximate daily rate for staff specialist I (salary plus benefits).

[7]SCG members were reimbursed for travel expenses to and from SCG meetings.

[8]Estimated.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS

A.1 SCG Events Checklist

A.2 School and Community Questionnaire

A.3 School and Community Questionnaire for non-English Speaking SCG Members

A.4 School and Community Questionnaire for non-English Speaking Community Members

A.5 Interview Schedule - Site A Visit

A.1 SCG EVENTS CHECKLIST

COMMUNITY _____

Item	Interview Date	Yes	No	Partial	Don't Know	Comments
1. Community members met with the PF team or other ESD representatives to discuss the School-Community Process.						
*2. Community members contributed information to a readiness survey.						
3. Community members agreed to participate in the School-Community Process.						
4. Community members contributed information to the baseline data collection.						
5. A TSCG (temporary school-community group) was formed.						
6. The TSCG conducted a survey to identify the leaders of community opinion groups.						
7. The TSCG developed criteria of membership for assuring that all community opinion groups would be represented on the SCG (school-community group).						
8. The TSCG identified potential SCG members based on the results of the opinion leader survey.						

*Optional activity/event

Item	Interview Date	Yes	No	Partial	Don't Know	Comments
9. The TSCG submitted to the school board their standards of representativeness and opinion leader nominations for SCG membership. a. standards of representativeness b. opinion leader nominations						
10. An SCG was formed and oriented by the school board. a. formed SCG b. oriented SCG						
11. The SCG prepared plans for a community-wide needs assessment.						
12. The SCG assessed its own capabilities to participate in the School-Community Process and planned activities to improve those capabilities.						
13. The SCG conducted a needs assessment study and reported the results to the school board and community. a. conducted study b. report to school board c. report to community						

Item	Interview Date	Yes	No	Partial	Don't know	Comments
14. The SCG analyzed results of needs assessment, prioritized needs, and selected an educational improvement project based on the results of needs assessment. a. analyzed results b. prioritized needs c. selected improvement						
15. The SCG presented a recommendation for an improvement project to the school board and the community for confirmation. a. to school board b. to community						
16. The SCG reviewed the criteria of mix and its membership periodically to ensure that the group truly represents the community.						
17. The SCG developed guidelines for searching alternative approaches to carrying out the proposed project.						
18. The SCG developed goals for the project and criteria for assessing the alternative approaches. a. goals b. criteria						

Item	Interview Date	Yes	No	Partial	Don't Know	Comments
19. The SCG searched for alternatives and gathered data about each alternative. a. searched for alternatives b. data about each alternative						
20. The SCG assessed each alternative in terms of the previously determined criteria						
21. The SCG selected the best approach and recommended it to the school board and the community. a. to school board b. to community						
22. The SCG analyzed the proposed educational improvement project to determine necessary activities and resources.						
23. The SCG involved others (e.g., school staff, school board, school and district administrators) in preparing implementation and evaluation plans. a. school staff b. school board c. administrators d. students e. others						

Item	Interview Date	Yes	No	Partial	Don't Know	Comments
24. The SCG presented implementation and evaluation plans to the school board and community. a. to school board b. to community						
25. The SCG arranged for special training necessary for community members to participate in carrying out the plans.						
*26. The SCG participated in and monitored a tryout of the project. a. participated in b. monitored						
27. The SCG analyzed the results of the tryout and decided whether or not modifications were needed before the project was incorporated as part of the regular school program.						
28. The SCG prepared a report on the results of the tryout and its recommendations for adaptation.						
29. The SCG reported to the school board and the community at large the results of the tryout and its recommendations. a. to school board b. to community						

*This event may be optional: programmatic projects need tryout; projects designed to improve school facilities may not.

Item	Interview Date	Yes	No	Partial	Don't Know	Comments
30. The SCG participated in project incorporation activities, i.e., full-scale implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.						
31. The SCG prepared progress reports on implementation and evaluation activities.						
32. The SCG made recommendations to modify activities based on evaluation results.						
33. The SCG presented progress reports to the school board and the community. a. to school board b. to community						
34. The SCG synthesized the progress reports and prepared a summary report on the educational improvement project.						
35. SCG members assessed skills gained through their participation in the School-Community Process and identified remaining skills needed for problem solving. a. assessed skills b. identified needed skills						

Item	Interview Date	Yes	No	Partial	Don't Know	Comments
36. The SCG presented its summary report to the school board, the school staff, and the community. a. school board b. school staff c. community						
37. The SCG negotiated with the school board a decision about starting another cycle of the School-Community Process.						

Comments:

A.2 SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE

ID # _____

Date _____

A-1 Would you say <u>your</u> involvement in maki[illegible] decisions about the schools during the pa[illegible] two years has: (circle the number of your answer)

1 Increased
2 Stayed the same
3 Decreased

A-2 Has your satisfaction with decisions which are made about the schools during the past two years: (circle the number of your answer)

1 Increased
2 Stayed the same
3 Decreased

A-3 Would you say the involvement of other <u>members of your community</u> in making the decisions about the schools in the past two years has: (circle the number of your answer of the ? mark)

1 Increased
2 Stayed the same
3 Decreased
? Don't know

A-4 How aware do you think school staff members, school board members, and community members were of your opinions about the school in September of 1974? How aware are they now? (circle the six answers. If you are not sure, circle the ? mark.)

	September 1974	not at all aware				very aware	
a.	school staff	1	2	3	4	5	?
b.	school board members	1	2	3	4	5	?
c.	community members	1	2	3	4	5	?

	June 1976	not at all aware				very aware	
a.	school staff	1	2	3	4	5	?
b.	school board members	1	2	3	4	5	?
c.	community members	1	2	3	4	5	?

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 248-6800

Rural Education Program

A-5 In the fall of 1974 the school district hired four process facilitators to work with community members and school staff in a school-community group (SCG). How aware are you of the work that the school-community group has done with the process facilitators? (circle your answer)

not at all aware — very aware

1 2 3 4 5 ?

A-6 How aware are you of the work the school staff has done with the process facilitators? (circle your answer)

not at all aware — very aware

1 2 3 4 5 ?

A-7 Has the work done by the school-community group and the school staff with the process facilitators improved the quality of education in your community? (circle your answer)

not at all — a great deal

1 2 3 4 5 ?

A-8 Has the overall quality of decisions about education in your community in the last two years improved? (circle your answer)

not at all — a great deal

1 2 3 4 5 ?

A-9 Use the space below to make any comments you have on community involvement in educational decision-making.

JG/jt
6/2/76

A.3 SCHOOL-COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE - NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING SCG MEMBERS

Check one

____ Montezuma Creek SCG

____ Oljato SCG

ID # _____

Date _____

1.	Do the meeting procedures used by your SCG (for example, appointing a chairman, building an agenda, writing down what happened) help to make the meetings more successful? (circle one)	yes	no	?
2.	Do you think all SCG members are welcome to participate in SCG meetings? (circle one)	yes	no	?
3.	Are all community members welcome to participate in SCG meetings? (circle one)	yes	no	?
4.	Do SCG members listen to and understand each other? (circle one)	yes	no	?
5.	Has your SCG worked with any of the following groups? If yes, check all that apply.	yes	no	?

☐ Other SCGs
☐ School Board
☐ School Staff
☐ Community Members
☐ Students

6.	Was the work your SCG did with other groups successful? (circle one)	yes	no	?
7.	Do you think your SCG has helped improve the education of students in your community? (circle one)	yes	no	?
8.	Has your SCG been successful? (circle one)	yes	no	?
9.	Do you think the SCG has helped the people in your community become more involved with the schools? (circle one)	yes	no	?

JLG/mp
5/27/76

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 248-6800

Rural Education Program

A.4 SCHOOL-COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE - NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Where do you live? (check one)

ID # _____

Date _____

___ Montezuma Creek
___ Oljato
___ Mexican Hat
___ Navajo Mt.
___ Gouldings
___ Other (specify _____)

There are a few questions I would like to ask you about education in your community. You may answer each question with a yes, no, or I don't know response.

1.	First, do teachers know what you think about the schools? (circle one)	yes	no	?
2.	Do school board members know what you think about the schools? (circle one)	yes	no	?
3.	Do other members of your community know what you think about the schools? (circle one)	yes	no	?
4.	Do you know about the work the school-community group (SCG) has done? (circle one)	yes	no	?
5.	Has the school-community group (SCG) helped more people in your community make decisions about the education of your children? (circle one)	yes	no	?
6.	Has the SCG helped improve education for students in your community? (circle one)	yes	no	?

JLG/mp
5/27/76

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 248-6800

Rural Education Program

A.5 SITE A INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SCHOOL-COMMUNITY GROUP MEMBERS (FEBRUARY 1976)

Date _____
Interviewers _____
Respondent Code _____
Duration of Interview _____

"We are interested in talking to you about the types of activities you have been engaged in since November."

1. What are the primary SCG activities you have been involved in during the last four months?

   a. In your opinion what has gone especially well? Why?

   b. What were some of the difficulties, if any, in conducting these activities?

2. a. How do you feel about the work the SCG is doing?

b. Has the work the SCG has done made a difference in the way the school board treats education issues? If yes, how has it made a difference?

c. What, if anything, would you like to see done differently? Why?

3. What kind of work, if any, has your SCG done with the other SCGs?

4. During the past four months, what activities have the process facilitators been involved in with your SCG?

   a. What role did the process facilitator play in these activities?

b. In general, how do you feel about the work the process facilitators have been doing?

5. Do you have any other comments about SCG activities?

JG/jt
2/17/76

APPENDIX B

BASELINE DATA

APPENDIX B

II. LOCAL DISTRICT BASELINE DATA COLLECTION FORM*

Data Collector J. Goforth Date 9/15/74

Name of District Site A (San Juan School District)

Address of District Monticello, Utah

I. School Enrollment

1. Public Schools

Type of School	Grade Levels	No. of Schools	Total Enrollment	Source of Data
Elementary	3-6 K-4 K-4	7	1527	Utah State Educ. Directory
	K-8 K-6			
	K-6 K-2			
High (Jr.-Sr.)	7-12 7-12	2	1134	
Other (Specify BIA)	K-6 + vocational	1	200	
Total pupil enrollment in district				

2. Private Schools

Type of School	Grade Levels	No. of Schools	Total Enrollment	
Elementary	1-8	1	25	School admin.
Junior High				
High				
Junior College				
Other (Specify)				
Total pupil enrollment in district				

Characteristics of the Population, 1970 Census of Population, U.S. Dept. of Commerce

*The term "district" refers to area covered by a local education agency.

Source of data

II. Voting Record on Educational Issues

1. List type of bonds and/or levies passed and years of passage for last 5 years — School District Office

Bond or Levy	Year
For construction of two new high schools within school district	1975

2. List type of bonds and/or levies not passed and years of nonpassage for last 5 years

Bond or Levy	Year
None	

III. Special Problems or Considerations of the Communities in the District: (e.g., lawsuits pending against the school district)

1. Geographical remoteness of area, large district with widely distributed population — School District Office
2. Bilingual-Bicultural population
3. District charged with discrimination against native American students

		Source of data
IV. Ethnic Composition of Total School District		1970 census data
1. Black/Negro	16	
2. Mexican American		
3. Caucasian	4826	
4. Oriental		
5. American Indian	4740	
6. Puerto Rican		
7. Other (Specify _____)	24	
V. School Budget (Public) (M & O)		
1. Total budget* (M & O)	$ 3,800,000.00	School District Office
2. Per pupil expenditure (M & O)	$ 1,384.00	School District Office
3. Special project funds, including government and private sources (Please specify ESEA, Title III, etc.)		
Title I	$ 489,028	School District Office
Title IV	$ 89,868	School District Office
JOM	$ 147,772	School District Office
	$	
VI. Description of District		
1. The district is 275 miles from a city of 25,000 or more		1970 Census Utah State map
2. Are there reasons why this district should not be considered as a rural area?		
Yes ____ No X		
Explain _____		

*Excluding special project funds.

Source of data

2. Mobility (Specify % or number)

a. How long does the average family stay in the district? N.A. years

b. Describe any pertinent information relating to the mobility or stability of the community in the district:

N.A.

3. Communication system used in district (Give names and town of origin of as many as appropriate)

a. Newspaper(s) San Juan Record (weekly)

b. Local radio station KATU

c. Local TV station none

4. Geographical setting of district

a. Location South Eastern Utah

b. Environment in general Desert, remote, isolated, numerous scenic and recreational attractions

5. Types of employment

Employment Development Division, Utah Dept. of Employment Security

a. Agriculture	10.4 %
b. Manufacturing	5.6 %
c. Retail (Trade)	11 %
d. Military	-- %
e. Service & Misc.	8 %
f. Mining	15 %
g. Government	23 %
h. All other non-agric.	27

		Source of data
VII. Personnel Statistics (Public)		
1. Teacher/pupil ratio	20/1	School District Office
2. Teachers transferring to other schools within district (specify number last year)	1	School District Office
3. Teachers leaving district (specify number last year)	17	School District Office
4. Teachers who are members of minority groups (specify number for current school year)	18	School District Office
5. Average length of service of teachers in this district	N.A.	
Less important:		
6. Teacher age range	N.A.	
7. Average age of teachers	N.A.	
8. Average age of administrators	N.A.	
9. Average level of education of teachers	N.A.	
VIII. PTA Information		
1. Existence: Yes ___ No X		
2. Membership	--	
3. Average attendance number	--	
Less important:		
4. Number of officers	--	
5. Frequency of meetings (per year)	--	
6. PTA newsletter Yes ___ No X		
7. Subscription to PTA newsletter (specify number of subscribers)	--	

		Source of data
IX. Income of Families in District		
1. Less than $3000	NA %	
2. $3000 - $7000	NA %	
3. More than $7000	NA %	
4. Median income	$ 6,604	1970 Census
5. Percent of population on welfare	NA %	
	14.9	1973 Census
6. Percent of unemployment	3.5%	1970 Census

32.9 percent of population in the county earn less than poverty level (1970 Census)

X. Pupil Information (Public)* - continued		
1. Ethnic composition of students		School District Student Population Profile Data Oct. 1, 1974
a. Black/Negro	4	
b. Caucasian	1379	
c. American Indian	1243	
d. Mexican American		
e. Puerto Rican		
f. Oriental (Asian American)	78	
g. Other (Specify _____)		
2. Total dropout rate	NA	
3. Dropout rate for minority groups		
_____	NA %	
_____	NA %	
_____	NA %	
_____	%	
4. Average daily attendance	2496	School District Office
5. Transfer rate within district	NA	
6. Transfer rate (out of district)	NA	

*See attached Pupil Information Sheet.

PUPIL INFORMATION

School District
Student Population Profile Data
October 1, 1974

School ID No.	Grades	American Indian	Black	Asian American	Spanish Surnamed American	Anglo	Total
1	3-6	170	1	0	8	182	361
2	K-4	107	0	0	0	17	124
3	K-4	0	0	0	2	22	11
4	K-8	183	0	0	0	1	184
5	K-6	276	1	0	0	29	306
6	K-6	8	0	0	26	281	315
7	K-2	117	1	1	2	150	271
8	7-12	8	0	1	28	315	352
9	7-12	374	1	3	7	382	767

Source of data

XI. Professional Personnel

School District Office 1972 Employee Population Profile

Category	No. of Personnel
a. Certificated Employees	139
b. Noncertificated Employees	148
c. Non-teaching certificated personnel (e.g., principal, head counselor, librarian, etc.)	NA

The following is considered less critical information. If available, these data should be collected.

XII. Ability and Achievement
(Specify instrument used and average score)

School District Office

Test	Grade	Date of Last Testing	Average Score
CAT (1957 ed)	3	April 1976	NA
CAT (1957 ed)	6	April 1976	NA
CAT (1957 ed)	8	April 1976	7.89
CAT (1957 ed)	11	April 1976	10.63

XIII. Population of LEA

1970 Census

1. Total 9606

2. Per square mile 1.2

64

		Source of data
XIV. Education Level of Adults in the District		1970 Census
1. Less than 8 years of schooling	1607	
2. Some high school	532	
3. High school graduate	880	
4. Some college	463	
5. College graduate	337	
6. Median school years completed by adults	10.7	
XV. Language Spoken at Home		
1. English	NA %	
2. Other (Specify Navaho)	NA %	
3. Other (Specify)	NA %	
XVI. Religious Affiliations		
1. Catholic	NA %	
2. Protestant	NA %	
3. Jewish	NA %	
4. Other	NA %	
XVII. Types of Households		
1. Two parent household	NA %	
2. Single parent household	NA %	
3. Single person household	NA %	
4. Other (Specify)	NA %	
XVIII. Political Affiliations		
1. Democratic	NA %	
2. Republican	NA %	
3. Independent	NA %	
4. Percent of qualified voters who are registered	NA %	